

were surprised to learn that the differences have gotten worse.

For example, Zocor, a very commonly prescribed drug for people who have some heart problems or problems with their circulation, Zocor in the United States on average sells for \$85 for a month's supply. In Germany you can buy that drug for \$23.83.

Mr. Speaker, what is interesting about this story is that one of my colleagues came up to me and he saw this chart. He said, I take Zocor. I said how much do you pay for it. He said a copay for a U.S. Congressman for that Zocor is \$30 here in the United States. You can walk in off the street to the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany and pay \$23.83, and the Germans think they are paying too much for prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I am holding in my hand two boxes of Celebrex. They are exactly the same. They come from the same plant. If you bought this box of Celebrex in the United States, you would pay more than double what you pay for the same drug in Germany.

Now, I think Americans are willing to, and I speak on behalf of most Americans, we understand there is a cost to develop these drugs. There is a cost to market these drugs. Unfortunately, there is too much being spent on advertising, but I am not one who says they should not be able to advertise. But I believe Americans ought to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices. I am asking my colleagues to join me in supporting, and I have another chart that is easier to read, compare London to Athens to the United States. We now have pharmacists from around the world who regularly send us their prices for the drugs.

In almost every case, it is less than half what we pay in the United States. These same five drugs, Lipitor, Nexium, Prevacid, Zoloft, and Zyrtec, those five drugs in London, \$195.95. In Athens, \$231.04; but here in the United States, \$507.96.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to please join me in cosponsoring H.R. 328, the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2005. It is time to make clear that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AIRPORT COMPETITION IN DALLAS-FORT WORTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of a law which has fostered spectacular growth and vitality in my district and throughout all of north Texas. That law, which has become known as the Wright amendment, was passed in 1979 to settle for all time a controversy on how best to achieve robust competitive airline competition in the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

It has worked and continues to work beyond all expectations, but the benefits it has brought can easily be undone. Given all of the turmoil in the airline industry and the limited time for Congress to get important business done, any serious effort to change the current law would be a misuse of our time and resources.

Since the issue has been in the news lately and Members have been approached with very simplistic answers on the surface, compelling arguments about the Wright amendment, I want to put some facts into the RECORD.

In the late 1960s, the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth, at the urgings of the Civil Aeronautics Board, agreed to end the fragmentation of air service in the region and invest in a single regional airport that could serve all of the people in the area. At the time, everyone knew a new airport would not work unless there was an absolute commitment by all parties to consolidate all the service from the various local airports in the area into the new facility, which became known as the Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport.

The two communities and all carriers offering interstate service from the existing airports agreed on this course of action. However, one carrier that at that time offered only interstate service from Dallas' downtown airport, Love Field, refused to do so.

This led to a long and protracted and bitter legal battle between the communities and this carrier, which ultimately resulted in a carefully negotiated compromise. This compromise encompassed into Federal law to preserve it was exactly constructed to reflect the intent of the communities as

well as the desires of the interstate carrier.

Reluctantly, the civic parties agreed to allow the one carrier that had refused to move to the DFW Airport to operate out of Love Field to and from points within Texas or to its four contiguous States. That carrier agreed to the Wright amendment as a way to settle the issue for all time.

Last week, the highly respected global aviation consulting firm, Simat, Helliesen & Eichner, released an omnibus report which predicts devastating consequences to the Dallas-Fort Worth Airport if the Wright amendment were to be repealed. I will submit the report for the RECORD; but it predicts if the Wright amendment is repealed, DFW could lose 204 flights a day, 21 million passengers annually, and slash DFW passenger traffic back to levels seen 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, health in the airline industry is dependent on healthy competition between airlines. In contrast, competition between very closely located airports can be destructive. The communities of Dallas and Fort Worth understood this when they agreed to end, or restrict, commercial air traffic to their local airports. DFW was built to accommodate any and all carriers, and over the years it has attracted both network and low-cost carriers.

Just as importantly, by limiting traffic at the neighboring airports, DFW was able to compete among airports and now is the fifth largest airport. Think of it this way. Almost everyone would agree it would improve competition to have 30 airlines competing against each other, but no one would suggest it would be healthy to have 30 airports competing against each other. Just like two major shopping centers will die if located next door to each other, two airports located only 12 miles apart, as are in Dallas, Love Field and DFW will provide two weaker airports.

Let us be perfectly clear. Restriction at Meacham and Love Fields were not put in place to give DFW a jump start. No one said, We will invest billions of dollars in a huge international airport and domestic hub airport until it is successful and then we will undercut the very source of its success by reopening the airports that we closed to make it so. That does not make good business sense.

Mr. Speaker, DFW is what it is today because it is the only airport in the metroplex that passengers can use to fly anywhere in the world. Moreover, it has not achieved the success it has by being anticompetitive. On the contrary, it has always welcomed all comers. DFW currently has gates available and is seeking new airlines.

Love Field was never meant to be a competitor to DFW. In fact, DFW would probably have never been built and the tens of thousands of jobs and the billions of dollars of economic stimulus it has given Dallas-Fort Worth would never have been realized